



**Caltrans District 4 Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)**  
**April 15, 2009, 9:30 - 11:30 AM**  
**Meeting Summary**

The meeting was attended by the following PAC members:

Lindsay Arnold, UC Berkeley Traffic Safety Center  
Emily Avery, San Mateo County Transit District  
Nancy Baer, Contra Costa Health Services  
Michelle DeRobertis, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Tom Ford, City of Oakland resident  
Nathan Landau, AC Transit  
Heath Maddox, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Robert Planthold, San Francisco resident  
Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority, PAC Vice Chair  
Sara Woo, Solano Transportation Authority

In addition, the following non-members attended:

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks  
Sean Co, Metropolitan Transportation Commission

The meeting began with self-introductions by attendees followed by the review and approval of the summary notes from the previous PAC meeting on January 21, 2009.

Following these items, Kevin Herritt, Chief Editor of the California Highway Design Manual for Caltrans, gave a verbal presentation by phone of the work of the Caltrans Multimodal Highway Design Manual (HDM) Review Team. His presentation covered the Team process and the types of observations that the Team has made about the HDM. Kevin said that he hoped that the PAC members would have another opportunity to comment later as the HDM is being edited. Following Kevin's presentation, the PAC members provided and adopted comments on the HDM. The set of comments (attached) has since been provided to Kevin as an appendix to the HDM Team Final Memo.

Next, Marc Birnbaum, the Caltrans Headquarters Chief of Local Development and Traffic Impact Studies, gave a verbal presentation by phone on the development of Caltrans' first-ever Transportation Analysis Report (TAR) guidance document. His presentation focused on the challenges created by the relative lack of availability of pedestrian models that are scalable to a

project size, the relative lack of adopted Highway Capacity Manual guidance on pedestrian analysis, and the need to develop thresholds of modal utility for use in balancing how different modes of transportation are accommodated at a given location. The PAC also received an outline of the sections that had been included in the TAR guidance draft as of the time of the meeting. Following Marc's presentation, the PAC members provided and adopted comments on the draft TAR guidance. The set of comments (attached) has since been provided to the consultant working on the TAR guidance.

The next item scheduled on the agenda was brainstorming to develop the fiscal year 2009-10 PAC Work Plan. However, the previous items had gone past their time allotment, so the PAC voted to postpone the development of the FY 09-10 Work Plan until the following PAC meeting, when they would also adopt the Work Plan.

Next the PAC discussed the scheduling of future meetings. Beth informed the PAC that their regularly scheduled meeting time – the third Wednesday of January, April, July and October – conflicted with the quarterly Caltrans District 4 Office Chiefs' meeting. Beth explained that this conflict made it difficult for her supervisor to attend PAC meetings and to schedule speakers. The PAC then gave their consent for Beth to identify a new regular meeting day and time by polling PAC members by email. Beth also informed the PAC that she would be on vacation when the July meeting was scheduled to occur. The PAC decided to postpone that meeting until after Beth's return and asked her to reschedule it by email.

Following this item, Beth provided a summary of the status of two projects about which the PAC had previously commented. The first was the US 101/Hearn Avenue overcrossing project in Santa Rosa. Beth explained that the further development of the project initiation document (PID) had been on hold due to a change in local priorities, but that she had learned that the PID work was about to resume. The second project was the I-880/280/Stevens Creek Interchange Modification project in San Jose. Beth gave an overview of the PAC comments that were being considered for incorporation into the PID and those that were not being addressed. The latter were primarily comments concerning local streets outside the project limit.

The next item on the agenda was public comment. No public comments were received.

Finally, the PAC briefly discussed topics for the next meeting.

**Comments from District 4 Pedestrian Advisory Committee**  
**On California Highway Design Manual**  
**April 15, 2009 Meeting**

- More guidance is needed on when different intersection and interchange configurations are appropriate.
- More flexibility is needed in lane widths especially for urban areas.
- Getting approval for bulbouts is challenging in the absence of a standard design. The HDM should have guidance on these.
- The HDM needs guidance for the treatment of pedestrian islands and refuges.
- The HDM should be more clear about local agencies needing to comply with Chapter 1000.
- Figures in the HDM need to be more multi-modal.
- The HDM should provide a minimum bus stop bulb length. Bus bulbs should not be too short. Bus cut-outs should be discouraged because they trap buses and delay transit service.
- The HDM should provide guidance on the minimum sidewalk width needed to accommodate bus stops and shelters.
- Guidance is needed on applying standards to different contexts. This goes beyond context-sensitivity. The six different facility types should be addressed head-on.
- A chapter should be added for urban arterial design standards.
- Pedestrian and bicycling issues should be spread throughout the HDM, but Chapter 1000 should be kept for handy reference by local agencies.
- Guidance in the HDM should be based on the roadway categorization and the application of a land use layer.
- The HDM should have standards tailored to city streets that are in state right-of-way when crossing a state highway.

**Comments from District 4 Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
On Development of Draft Caltrans Transportation Analysis Report Guidance  
April 15, 2009 Meeting**

- Pedestrian, bicyclist and transit modes should be counted and included in the project purpose & need statement and existing conditions, forecasting and analysis sections.
- The report should acknowledge the historical bias toward motorized vehicles.
- The University of California Traffic Safety Center has pedestrian and bicyclist count documentation and forms available to send to Caltrans.
- Bicyclists need to be included in the existing conditions and analysis results sections.
- Activity-based models are better for predicting mode split than 4-step models and are being used around the State. These should be discussed in the forecasting section.
- A state-level working group on multimodal LOS should be established.
- Traditional LOS is biased toward motorized vehicles. Pedestrian and bicyclist LOS measures should be included.
- Mitigation measures for autos that negatively impact pedestrians and bicyclists should either not be done or, at the very least, documented regarding those impacts.